

## 2002 ACCOUNTABILITY UPDATE

December 2002

### Background

Language in the 1997-99 budget directed the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) to implement an accountability system in consultation with the four-year institutions, tying resources to plans and performance.

The Operating Budget for the 2001-03 biennium (*Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 5163, Section 601*) states:

*Each institution receiving appropriations under Section 604 through 609 of this act shall submit a biennial plan to achieve measurable and specific improvement each academic year as part of a continuing effort to make meaningful and substantial progress towards the achievement of long-term performance goals. The plans, to be prepared at the direction of the higher education coordinating board, shall be submitted by August 15, 2001. The higher education coordinating board shall set biennial performance targets for each institution and shall review actual achievements annually. Institutions shall track their actual performance on the statewide measures as well as faculty productivity, the goals and targets for which may be unique to each institution. A report on progress toward statewide and institution-specific goals, with recommendations for the ensuing biennium, shall be submitted to the fiscal and higher education committees of the legislature by November 15, 2003.*

In October 2001, the Board approved new targets for the 2001-03 biennium. This report compares 2001-02 performance against those targets, as well as against the 1996-99 baseline.

Each institution is required to report on a total of six measures:

- 1) Graduation Efficiency (Freshmen)
- 2) Graduation Efficiency (Transfers)
- 3) Undergraduate Retention
- 4) Five-Year Freshman Graduation Rate
- 5) Faculty Productivity (which can be measured differently by each institution)
- 6) A unique measure for each institution, reflective of its mission

The first four measures listed are common to all the baccalaureate institutions. Graduation efficiency is calculated by dividing the total number of credits required for a baccalaureate degree (minus transfer credits) by the total number of credits completed at that institution.

This calculation gives a measure of “efficiency” in terms of credits completed, rather than measuring efficiency in terms of calendar time to degree, which can be skewed by part-time attendance. Retention rates refer to the number of undergraduate students who return for consecutive years. The percentage of freshmen who graduate within five years is calculated as the fourth common measure. The last two measures are institution-specific, and the manner in which they are calculated can vary by institution.

Summarized data for 2001-02 reveal that:

- Performance for 47 percent of the measures meets or exceeds 2001-03 targets.
- Performance for 79 percent of the measures has improved since 1996-99 (the baseline).

One year remains in the biennium for institutions to meet their targets. For some measures, especially those where little or no improvement has occurred since the baseline period, it may be difficult to meet those targets.

A summary of institutions’ attainment of 2001-03 targets, and the increase in performance necessary to meet the targets on the four measures common to all institutions, follows:

	<b>CWU</b>	<b>EWU</b>	<b>TESC</b>	<b>UW</b>	<b>WSU</b>	<b>WWU</b>
Grad Efficiency: Freshmen	Yes	No 1.9%	No 2.0%	No 2.7%	No 1.6%	No 0.1%
Grad Efficiency: Transfers	Yes	No 4.4%	Yes	No 4.3%	No 0.6%	No 2.5%
Undergraduate Retention (overall)	No 2.0%	No 3.4%	Yes	No 3.9%	No 0.3%	Yes
5-Year Freshmen Graduation	Yes	No 9.5%	Yes	No 0.2%	No 2.1%	Yes

The next accountability report, due November 15, 2003, will provide 2002-03 data and progress toward goals, along with recommendations for the 2003-05 biennium.

## **2001-02 ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE**

**Central Washington University**

**Eastern Washington University**

**The Evergreen State College**

**University of Washington**

**Washington State University**

**Western Washington University**

## CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

	1996-99 Baseline	2000-01 Performance	2001-02 Performance	2001-03 Target	Target met?	Does 2001-02 performance exceed baseline?
<b>Common Measures</b>						
<u>Graduation Efficiency Index</u>						
Freshmen	88.0	85.6	92.3	90.0	yes	yes
Transfers	83.8	80.7	89.2	85.0	yes	yes
Undergraduate Retention (overall)	80.5%	82.3%	82.0%	84.0%	no	yes
5-Year Freshman Graduation Rate	39.4%	44.9%	45.7%	45.0%	yes	yes
<b>Institution-Specific Measures</b>						
<u>Faculty Productivity</u>						
Expected Learning Outcomes	92.6%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	yes	yes
% Faculty Mentoring Students	22.5%	18.2%	18.2%	22.5%	no	no
Ratio of Student FTE to Faculty FTE	22.2	21.0	23.1	22.5	yes	yes
Transfer Students with Declared Majors	75.1%	78.1%	80.9%	77.0%	yes	yes
Minority Graduation Rate	22.6%	27.5%	26.6%	24.0%	yes	yes
Internship Participation	7.3%	8.0%	7.8%	8.0%	no	yes

***DESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC MEASURES***

**Expected Learning Outcomes:** Percentage of degree programs with specifically stated, publicized learning outcomes.

**% Faculty Mentoring Students:** Percentage of full-time faculty mentoring students in established programs that incorporate a faculty-student mentoring relationship (e.g., CWU research symposium, McNair Scholars Program).

**Ratio of Student FTE to Faculty FTE:** The ratio of student FTEs to faculty FTEs (IPEDS defined).

**Transfer Students with Declared Majors:** The percentage of undergraduate transfer students who have declared majors by the end of the third quarter at CWU.

**Minority Graduation Rate:** Ratio of the number of minority students graduating to all enrolled minority students fall quarter (averaged over three years).

**Internship Participation:** Percentage of students participating in cooperative education internships (averaged over three years).

***CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY: COMMENTS ON PERFORMANCE***

Central has met 2001-03 graduation efficiency targets for both freshmen and transfers. This improved performance is attributed by Central as the result of both improved performance and greater accuracy in determining credits required toward different degrees, an essential component of the Graduation Efficiency Index (GEI) equation.

Although undergraduate retention has improved since the 1996-99 baseline, it may be difficult for Central to increase its performance by two percentage points in time to meet the 2001-03 target of 84 percent, especially since Central reports that surveys of non-retained students indicate that they leave for personal or financial reasons, rather than factors that might be influenced by the institution. Central's surveys also indicate that these students are likely to enroll in a community college within a short period, so it is important to note they are not lost to the higher education system completely but instead may be looking for a less expensive route to a degree.

Nearly 46 percent (45.7%) of Central's freshmen graduate within five years, slightly surpassing the 2001-03 target of 45 percent.

All institution-specific measures exceeded projected targets with the exception of two: (1) the percentage of faculty mentoring students; and (2) internship participation. Central explains its performance in faculty mentoring, which has decreased since 1996-99, as related to drops in funding for undergraduate research. Declines in internship participation are more difficult to explain; Central speculates the reason may be due largely to fluctuations in student behavior.

## EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

	1996-99 Baseline	2000-01 Performance	2001-02 Performance	2001-03 Target	Target met?	Does 2001-02 performance exceed baseline?
<b>Common Measures</b>						
<u>Graduation Efficiency Index</u>						
Freshmen	87.9	88.3	89.1	91.0	no	yes
Transfers	77.9	77.4	78.7	83.1	no	yes
Undergraduate Retention (overall)	88.5%	87.4%	85.8%	89.2%	no	no
5-Year Freshman Graduation Rate	41.7%	39.3%	39.5%	49.0%	no	no
<b>Institution-Specific Measures</b>						
<u>Faculty Productivity</u>						
Student Credit Hours/FTE Faculty	305.9	358.0	358.0	333.6	yes	yes
Experiential Learning	2,422	3,107	5,153	2,998	yes	yes
Courses Using Distance Learning Technology	6.4	26.0	29.0	37.0	no	yes
Freshman Academic Involvement Index	33.7	Unavailable	33.9	37.0	no	yes

***DESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC MEASURES***

**Student Credit Hours/FTE Faculty:** A ratio of student credit hours to IPEDS-defined faculty FTE for fall quarter.

**Experiential Learning (previously entitled Internship/Service Learning Experience):**

Total number of students taking experientially-based courses, including research-directed studies, internship, cooperative education and/or service learning credits. Note: The measure definition was changed for the current biennium to include research directed studies as a form of “hands-on” learning experience.

**Courses Using Distance Learning Technology:** The annual number of courses offered by faculty who use the worldwide Web.

**Freshman Academic Involvement Index:** The sample average for an 11-question index derived from the College Student Experience Questionnaire (CSEQ) administered annually to students.

***EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY: COMMENTS ON PERFORMANCE***

Eastern's graduation efficiency index measures for both freshmen and transfer students show improvement over the baseline and since 2000-01. An intensive review of programs and curriculum, including an audit of GEI performance at the college and program/department level, is underway. Eastern expects continued progress toward 2001-03 targets as the result of these efforts.

Undergraduate retention in 2001-02 has declined since the baseline and since 2000-01, and Eastern will conduct an in-depth study to better understand the underlying dynamics of this trend.

The five-year freshman graduation rate has declined since the baseline period, and it will be difficult for Eastern to increase by 9.5 percentage points in time to meet its 2001-03 goal. Nevertheless, the intensive program review under way at Eastern is expected to have an impact on this measure during the remaining year of the biennium.

Student Credit Hours per FTE Faculty has steadily increased and has already met the 2001-03 target. Eastern demonstrates high levels of student-centered "hands-on" learning experience in its Experiential Learning measure, which has also met the 2001-03 target. Although courses using distance learning technology have not increased as much as expected, Eastern reports increasing numbers of faculty receiving Internet training, and a major initiative under way to move traditional pencil- and paper-based correspondence and independent learning courses to the Web over the next few years.

The freshman academic involvement index is composed of several different elements. Though this measure shows a slight improvement since the baseline period, Eastern staff have found that some elements of the index have shown a decline. Elements that declined include: fewer students reported asking academic librarians for help, and fewer students discussed their future plans with faculty. These data, along with other findings drawn from the index questionnaire, will be discussed with faculty and students during meetings on the student experience during winter quarter 2003.

## THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE

	1996-99 Baseline	2000-01 Performance	2001-02 Performance	2001-03 Target	Target met?	Does 2001-02 performance exceed baseline?
<b>Common Measures</b>						
<u>Graduation Efficiency Index</u>						
Freshmen	93.0	93.8	92.0	94.0	no	no
Transfers	90.0	91.6	90.0	90.0	yes	equal
Undergraduate Retention (Overall)	76.0%	78.2%	80.0%	78.0%	yes	yes
5-Year Freshman Graduation Rate	45.0%	45.3%	47.0%	46.0%	yes	yes
<b>Institution-Specific Measures</b>						
Undergraduate Retention (Freshmen)	65.0%	<i>Unavailable</i>	71.0%	75.0%	no	yes
<u>Faculty Productivity</u>						
Life-Long Learning Index	31.7	31.5	31.9	31.9	yes	yes
Freshman-Familiarity w/Computers	2.28	2.25	2.01	2.48	no	no
Freshman-Quantitative Thinking	1.88	1.99	2.24	2.08	yes	yes
<u>Diversity</u>						
Retention, Students of Color (Olympia)	77.0%	78.5%	77.0%	80.0%	no	equal
Student Diversity Learning	3.18	3.29	3.29	3.49	no	yes

### DESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC MEASURES

**Undergraduate Retention (Freshmen):** While reporting overall fall-to-fall retention as one of its common measures, Evergreen continues to focus on retention of entering freshmen students as an institution-specific measure in the current biennium. Again, this is consistent with an internal focus on improvement. Evergreen also selected retention of students of color on the Olympia campus as one of its two institution-specific diversity measures.

**Life-Long Learning Index:** This index is a composite measure of students' estimated gains in learning 11 different areas. For the current biennium, Evergreen is focusing on two specific items within this index, specifically improvement reported by first-time, first-year students. The items are learning gains in "familiarity with the use of computers" and "quantitative thinking." Students rate each learning gain item on a 4-point scale from 1=very little progress to 4=very much progress. This focus is consistent with institutional initiatives related to General Education at Evergreen.

**Student Diversity Learning:** Students' reported gains at Evergreen in "understanding other people and the ability to get along with different kinds of people" (from the Life-long Learning Index/College Student Experience Questionnaire).

***THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE: COMMENTS ON PERFORMANCE***

Graduation efficiency for freshmen and transfer students dropped slightly this year, but the 2001-03 target for transfer students has been achieved. For the first time this year, graduation efficiency reporting was captured through a new student tracking system; therefore minor fluctuations may be due to getting the results through a new process with a new data source.

Overall undergraduate retention has remained strong and performance has surpassed the 2001-03 target. Freshman retention reflects similar gains -- improving two percentage points from last year and has exceeded the performance target. Evergreen will continue its efforts to improve freshman retention and will continue to strive for ambitious goals.

Evergreen's freshman graduation rate is highly correlated with freshman retention to the sophomore year. Therefore, although the graduation rate this year increased and surpassed the 2001-03 target, TESC predicts a decrease next year based on low freshmen retention for the cohort coming up for five-year graduation next year.

The Lifelong Learning Index has met the 2001-03 target. However, "familiarity with computers" has decreased, despite Evergreen's efforts to increase the presence of information technology literacy offerings. Based on concerns that "familiarity with computers" was too broad a question to gain meaningful results, a new, more specific technology item was added to the survey of student learning gains in 2002. The college intends to track this item closely and may propose it as a new institution-specific measure for next biennium's accountability report.

Gains in quantitative thinking exceeded the 2001-03 target. Evergreen began a systematic effort to increase the prevalence of quantitative reasoning across the curriculum in summer 2000 and plans to continue efforts in this area.

Retention of students of color at Olympia improved slightly last year, but this year fell to the same level as reported for the baseline period of 1996-99. According to Evergreen staff, although retention of Native American and African-American students increased, retention for Hispanic and Asian/Pacific Islander students decreased. Evergreen plans to continue its efforts retaining students of color.

Diversity learning has remained steady since 2000-01. Evergreen plans to improve this measure through explicit curriculum planning, support services, campus activities, opportunities for dialogue, collaborative learning, faculty development, and partnerships with community-based organizations.

## UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON	1996-99 Baseline	2000-01 Performance	2001-02 Performance	2001-03 Target	Target met?	Does 2001-02 performance exceed baseline?
<b>Common Measures</b>						
<u>Graduation Efficiency Index</u>						
Freshmen	89.6	90.8	90.5	93.2	no	yes
Transfers	81.7	82.7	82.7	87.0	no	yes
Undergraduate Retention (Overall)	87.2%	88.5%	88.5%	92.4%	no	yes
5-Year Freshman Graduation Rate	63.8%	64.0%	64.8%	65.0%	no	yes
<b>Institution Specific Measures</b>						
<u>Faculty Productivity</u>						
Enrollment Demand Satisfied	84.8%	88.9%	87.6%	89.4%	no	yes
Quality of Instruction	93.7%	93.7%	94.7%	96.9%	no	yes
Research Funding/Faculty Member	\$216,774	\$262,810	\$269,493	no target set*	n/a	yes
Student Credit Hours/Faculty FTE	202.90	209.40	210.56	209.50	yes	yes
<u>Instruction</u>						
# Undergrads w/Intense Research Involvement	1,122	3,077	3,258	775	yes	yes
Individualized Instruction	4.0%	4.3%	4.4%	4.6%	no	yes
Public Service Internships	842	3355	3561	1535	yes	yes
% Undergrads in Faculty Research	22.4%	28.8%	28.4%	23.7%	yes	yes

\*Depends on availability of federal research funds.

**DESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC MEASURES**

**Enrollment Demand Satisfied:** The proportion of enrollment demand satisfied by offered enrollment space (course openings).

**Quality of Instruction:** Percent of students evaluating “amount you learned in the course” as “good or better” (3.0 or above on 5-point scale) on standardized course evaluations.

**Funding for Research per Faculty FTE:** Grants and contracts per faculty FTE (in nominal dollars).

**Student Credit Hours Instructed Per Faculty FTE:** State-reported Student Credit Hours divided by Instructional Faculty FTE.

**Individualized Instruction:** Numbers of hours taken as individualized instruction divided by all undergraduate hours.

**Number of Undergraduates Intensively Involved in Research:** Number of students who work with faculty on research for 10+ hours per week for at least one quarter; data provided by Office of Undergraduate Education.

**Percent Undergraduate Credits Taken as Individualized Instruction:** This measures one-on-one intensive academic experiences for undergraduates offered by university faculty.

**Number of Undergraduates Involved with Public Service Internships:** Number of students who are involved in public service connected with their studies for 10+ hours per week; data provided by Carlson Center For Public Service.

**Percent of Undergraduates Reporting a Research Experience with Faculty:** Derived from an annual survey of graduating senior students; provides a measure of the cumulative experience over all undergraduate years.

#### ***UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON: COMMENTS ON PERFORMANCE***

Although all of the University of Washington measures have improved since the baseline period, none of the four measures common to all institutions have met the 2001-03 targets. Graduation efficiency and undergraduate retention will need significant gains in the next year in order to attain 2001-03 goals, but the Five-Year Freshman Graduation Rate is very close to meeting the target.

Enrollment Demand Satisfied, Quality of Instruction, and Individualized Instruction are the only three institution-specific measures that have not met the 2001-03 targets. All of the institution-specific measures have shown impressive growth since the baseline period.

The University of Washington reports that its growth in student involvement in research with faculty continues, and that involvement in several statewide efforts will continue to improve student progress. The most far-reaching of these efforts is a statewide database project, Mutual Research Transcript Enterprise (MRTE), which is expected to have important consequences for transfer articulation. Additionally, statewide assessment projects in writing and information literacy are continuing to evolve. Both of these initiatives promise strides in assessment and accountability.

## WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

	1996-99 Baseline	2000-01 Performance	2001-02 Performance	2001-03 Target	Target met?	Does 2001-02 performance exceed baseline?
<b>Common Measures</b>						
<u>Graduation Efficiency Index</u>						
Freshmen	90.0	90.0	89.9	91.5	no	no
Transfers	81.0	82.6	83.0	83.6	no	yes
Undergraduate Retention (Overall)	84.4%	86.5%	86.1%	86.4%	no	yes
5 year Freshmen Graduation Rate	53.8%	55.8%	53.8%	55.9%	no	equal
<b>Institution Specific Measures</b>						
Freshman Retention	83.7%	83.5%	82.9%	84.7%	no	no
<u>Faculty Productivity</u>						
Student Credit Hours/Faculty FTE	198.5	202.1	213.6	207.7	yes	yes
Individualized Enrollment/Faculty	3.7	3.6	3.8	3.8	yes	yes
Research and Scholarship	80.3%	Not reported	84.4%	no target set *	yes	yes
<u>Technology for Learning</u>						
Distance Student Credit Hours	24,204	46,917	47,306	no target set *	yes	yes
Degree Programs via Distance	6	11	11	12	no	yes
Reengineered Courses	131	754	758	no target set *	yes	yes
Classrooms with Technology	51.4%	73.2%	72.9%	70.0%	yes	yes

\*Performance meets or exceeds long-term targets; therefore no target was set for 2001-03.

***DESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC MEASURES***

**Freshman Retention:** To better manage its efforts, WSU has set a target for freshman retention, while continuing to report overall undergraduate retention as a measure common to all institutions.

**Individualized Enrollment/Faculty:** Measures the amount of work faculty do with students in the form of supervising undergraduate research, internships, senior theses, private lessons, and independent studies. (This measure tends to rise and fall with the size of the junior/senior classes.)

**Student Credit Hours per Faculty FTE:** Number of credit hours generated per instructional faculty FTE. (This measure tends to rise and fall with the size of the freshman/sophomore classes.)

**Research and Scholarship:** Percent of faculty completing the expected amount and type of scholarship during the past year, based on each college's definition of what constitutes scholarly work in that field.

**Distance Student Credit Hours:** Credit hours earned through interactive video courses, pre-recorded video courses, online courses and multiple mode courses.

**Degree Programs via Distance:** Number of different degree programs offered entirely at a distance, through electronic media such as interactive video, online courses, etc.

**Reengineered Courses:** Number of courses taught "primarily" by electronic means, including WHETS, online, e-mail, video-conference, etc.

**Classrooms with Technology:** Percent of university classrooms equipped to support technology-intensive teaching.

#### ***WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY: COMMENTS ON PERFORMANCE***

WSU has not met any of the targets set for 2001-03 measures common to all institutions. However, given its past performance and small gains needed to meet the targets, it is very likely the university will achieve the 2001-03 goals.

All but two institution-specific measures have achieved 2001-03 targets. The two that have yet to achieve the targets are: Freshman Retention and Degree Programs via Distance. WSU needs to add one more distance degree program to achieve the goal for Degree Programs via Distance. Meeting the goal for freshman retention may be difficult, although the recent drop in performance for this measure is not characteristic when compared to baseline and 2000-01 performance.

## WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

	1996-99 Baseline	2000-01 Performance	2001-02 Performance	2001-03 Target	Target met?	Does 2001-02 performance exceed baseline?
<b>Common Measures</b>						
<u>Graduation Efficiency Index</u>						
Freshmen	86.6	87.7	86.9	87.0	no	yes
Transfers	80.5	79.9	79.5	82.0	no	no
Undergraduate Retention (overall)	85.5%	86.5%	88.4%	86.0%	yes	yes
5-year Freshman Graduation Rate	54.0%	54.3%	54.5%	54.0%	yes	yes
<b>Institution-Specific Measures</b>						
Undergraduate Retention (frosh to soph.)	80.3%	79.4%	81.1%	82.0%	no	yes
5-year Minority Graduation Rate	38.4%	46.4%	41.1%	39.0%	yes	yes
Transfers graduating with a B.S. in science (grad efficiency)	71.3	69.8	70.7	74.0	no	<b>no</b>
<u>Faculty Productivity</u>						
Individualized Credits/FTE Student	1.43	1.61	1.64	1.50	yes	yes
Student Credit Hrs/Undergrad FTE Writing Courses	2.10	unavailable	unavailable	2.25	unknown	unknown
Hours Scheduled in Computer Labs	22.4	21.4	22.8	25.0	no	yes
Departments Adopting Advising Model	0.0%	64.3%	78.0%	75.0%	yes	yes

***DESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC MEASURES***

**Undergraduate Retention (freshman to sophomore):** Measures the percentage of freshmen returning for their second year.

**Five-Year Minority Graduation Rate:** The percentage of minority students who graduate within five years.

**Transfers Graduating with a B.S. in Science:** Graduation efficiency for transfer students who earn a bachelor's degree in Science.

**Individualized Credit/FTE Student:** Measures the number of credits generated per FTE student through individual instructional activities, including internships, work on faculty research projects, and other one-on-one activities.

**SCH/Undergraduate FTE in Writing Courses:** Student credit hours per undergraduate FTE in courses designated as principally or specifically writing based.

**Hours Scheduled in Computer Labs:** Measures the number of student hours scheduled in university or departmental computer labs per FTE undergraduate.

**Departments Adopting Advising Model:** Measures the proportion of Western's academic departments that have fully implemented all elements of Western's Departmental Advising Model. Components: (a) A clearly defined departmental advising program, with advisor, location, hours, etc., easily accessible and known; (b) a departmental advising Web page fully operational, based on the established template and criteria; (c) provision of an individualized, written plan of study to each student upon declaration of the major; (d) sponsorship of at least one event annually to help pre-majors decide on a major; and (e) sponsorship of at least one event annually to help advanced majors in the department explore career and graduate school options.

### ***WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY: COMMENTS ON PERFORMANCE***

WWU has met 2001-03 goals for two of the four measures common to all institutions: Undergraduate Retention and the Five-Year Freshman Graduation Rate. However, graduation efficiency for freshmen is very close to the 2001-03 target, and graduation efficiency for transfers is fairly close to the target.

The institution-specific measures demonstrate good progress, with all but one improved since the baseline, and all but three reaching 2001-03 goals.<sup>1</sup> Freshmen to sophomore retention is very close to the 2001-03 goal, though not quite there yet. Graduation efficiency for transfers graduating with a bachelor's degree in science has decreased since the 1996-99 baseline period but has improved since 2000-01. Hours scheduled in computer labs, although improved, would have to reach a high level of performance in the next year to meet the goal.

---

<sup>1</sup> Data for Student Credit Hours/Undergraduate FTE Writing Courses was not available at the time this report was written but will be added as soon as it becomes available.